

Remarks

The claims currently present upon entry of this Response are claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 25.

Applicants have limited the broadest product claim, claim 1, to resins prepared by reacting a polyamidoamine A with a cross-linking agent K that is defined in Markush language. It is pointed out that all crosslinkers are triglycidyl polyepoxides.

Limitation of claim 1 to polyamidoamines is supported at page 6, line 14. Limitation to triglycidyls is supported by now cancelled original claim 9.

Claims 6, 10, 13 and 14 were amended to conform them to the language of amended claim 1. Claims 14 and 25 are original claims.

THE REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC 103

With the narrowing of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that the remaining claims are patentable over the cited art. The references will be discussed in the order presented by the Examiner.

Smigo, US 5 281 307, was cited by the Examiner, saying that it teaches that polyepoxides are linear crosslinking agents for polymers having certain crosslinkable groups. The Examiner points to Smigo's alleged teaching of crosslinking of vinylamines with epoxys.

However, now that the claims have been narrowed, it is appropriate to consider Smigo's relevance to these claims. It is pointed out that Smigo teaches only that copolymers of PVOH/VAM can be crosslinked with epoxys (column 4, lines 31-34 and column 6, line 11). There is no teaching or suggestion concerning polyamidoamines. More importantly, column 6, lines 8-13 recite a number of crosslinking agents and says at the end of this sentence that the crosslinking agents are ones that are "commonly employed

for poly(vinyl alcohol). There is simply no suggestion that polymers not containing OH groups, such as polyamidoamine, can be crosslinked with epoxys. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Smigo is no longer relevant to the amended claims. Since Smigo is the primary reference, its inapplicability makes the entire rejection unsustainable and applicants' present claims should be found allowable with no further argument. However, to complete the record, the secondary references will now be briefly discussed.

Cortigene USP 3 600 272 was cited for its teaching of reaction of polyethyleneimine with a diepoxy compound. One epoxy described is 1,4 butanediol diglycidyl ether (column 5, lines 70-71). However, there is no disclosure of polyamidoamines, and it is pointed out that the epoxys now claimed in applicants' claim 1 are all triglycidyl ethers. Furthermore, in the Cortigene patent it is the epoxy resin that is being crosslinked by the polyethyleneimine.

Devlin USP 057 833 was cited for its teaching of the preparation of polyalkylamines and their reaction with polyepoxides to cure the polyepoxide (column 4, lines 54-55). Glycidyl polyethers of polyhydric phenol are mentioned at column 4, lines 74-75. Polyalkylamines are not suggestive of polyamidoamines. Nor is the glycidyl described suggestive of the specific triglycidyl ethers recited in present claim 1.

Morrison, Lee and Neville, PL '185 and Sadler were all cited to piece together an argument that since azetidinium groups are electron deficient, they are Lewis' acids which are curing agents for epoxys. Therefore, anything with azetidinium groups is a curing agent for epoxys. While this broad stroke sequence of logic might have been appropriate for the very broad claims originally submitted, it provides little guidance to the subject matter of present claim 1. Similarly, the breadth of PL'185 renders it inappropriate for use against the present claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 25 are patentable over the cited references. Their allowance and passage of the case to issuance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary A. Samuels
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 20,811

Hercules Incorporated
Hercules Plaza
1313 North Market Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19894-0001
September 27, 2004
Attorney's Direct Dial: (302) 594-6813